1

3

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

JACK SMITH SR.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v

JANET NAPOLITANO, et al.,

Defendants.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

13

14

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Judgment (#41). Plaintiff

ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Case No. 2:11-CV-1138-KJD-CWH

seeks relief from the Court's order dismissing his action because Plaintiff failed to file any response

to Defendants' motion to dismiss. Generally speaking, the Court construes pro se pleadings

liberally. However, pro se parties are expected to abide by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures just

as parties represented by counsel. Plaintiff had previously been granted extensions of time to

associate counsel after his initial counsel withdrew from representation. However, after failing to

meet the last deadline given him by the court or to seek a timely extension, as he had done

previously, the Court granted Defendants' unopposed motion to dismiss.

Plaintiff now asserts that he mistakenly believed that the thirty day extension given him by the Court did not include weekends and holidays. However, Plaintiff had previously met deadlines timely without excluding weekends and holidays. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(a)(1)(B) clearly

Case 2:11-cv-01138-KJD-CWH Document 43 Filed 03/04/13 Page 2 of 2

states that Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays should be counted in computing time. Here, Plaintiff's alleged misunderstanding of the Rules is not excusable neglect justifying an extension of time for good cause under Rule 6(b)(1)(a) or Rule 60. Further, even if the Court found excusable neglect, Plaintiff has not asserted that he has a meritorious opposition to the motion to dismiss, such as actual exhaustion of his claims under the Federal Tort Claim Act. Therefore, the Court must deny Plaintiff's motion because he has failed to show mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect and granting him leave to file a belated opposition would be futile.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Judgment

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Judgment (#41) is **DENIED**.

DATED this 4th day of March 2013.

Kent J. Dawson

United States District Judge